

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,351	12/16/2003	Ivan Sepetka	005-004-C1	9651
32746 7590 05/07/2007 HOEKENDIJK & LYNCH, LLP P.O. BOX 4787			EXAMINER	
			TRUONG, KEVIN THAO	
BURLINGAME, CA 94011-4787			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	_		
Office Action Summary						
		10/738,351	SEPETKA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kevin T. Truong	3734			
r Period for F	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address			
WHICHI - Extensio after SIX - If NO pe - Failure to	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The following of the provision of the	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>RCE</u>	and Amendt. 04/16/2007.				
<i>,</i> —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
•	ince this application is in condition for allowar					
cl	osed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition	of Claims			•		
4a 5)□ C 6)図 C 7)□ C	laim(s) 39-44 is/are pending in the application  Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawlaim(s) is/are allowed.  laim(s) 39-44 is/are rejected.  laim(s) is/are objected to.  laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application	n Papers					
10)□ Th A R	ne specification is objected to by the Examine ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepplicant may not request that any objection to the eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correctic oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date			

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351

Art Unit: 3734

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/16/2007 has been entered.

### **Double Patenting**

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 39-44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 9-13, 17, 18, 23, and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,650. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351

Art Unit: 3734

not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

- 3. Claims 39-44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,545. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.
- 4. Claims 39-44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,104. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively broad subject matter claimed in the instant application such as an elongated obstruction removing element is used for removing obstruction in body when the elongated obstruction removing element is in the expanded configuration, which would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351

Art Unit: 3734

## Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 04/16/2007, with respect to claims 39-44 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 39-44 has been withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

3. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/738,351. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-

Application/Control Number: 10/738,351 Page 5

Art Unit: 3734

4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin T. Truong <sup>L</sup> Primary Examiner Art Unit 3734

ktt